

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted simultaneously with filing of the Request for Continuing Examination.

In the Office Action of December 13, 2004, the Examiner rejected the claims over the patent to Gelati as being anticipated.

In the subsequent telephonic conference, the Examiner explained his interpretation of the device disclosed in the patent to Gelati.

In connection with this, applicant has amended claims 1 and 7 to more clearly define the present invention and to distinguish it from the references.

In order to more clearly explain the differences between the device disclosed in the patent to Gelati and the device of the present invention, applicant submits herewith a copy of Figure 1 from the present application and a copy of the drawing from the patent to Gelati.

Both devices are used for quick connection and disconnection of the conductors. The unit in accordance with the present invention

includes at least two mechanical devices accommodated in a single body. Each of the mechanical devices has two opposite sides which are spaced from one another in a predetermined direction. Each of the devices on each side has two holes 7 which are spaced from one another in a first direction which in the embodiment shown in Figure 1 of the present application is a horizontal transverse direction for example from left to right. Each device has an operating lever having two identical levers 9a and 9b which are also spaced from one another in the same first direction, or in other words in the horizontal transverse direction in Figure 1. Also, the parts of each resilient metal strip for the levers are also spaced from each other in the same first direction or in the transverse horizontal direction in Figure 1. Thus, summarizing of the above, in the unit of the present invention, on one side of one device (and also on another side of the one device) the two holes are spaced in the first direction, the two levers are also spaced in the same first direction, and the parts of the resilient metal strip are also spaced from each other in the same first direction.

Turning now to the references and in particular to the patent document to Gelati, it can be seen that on one side of each device the two holes 3 are spaced from one another in a first direction which is a transverse horizontal direction. On another opposite side of the device, the two holes 3 are also spaced in the same first direction which is the transverse

horizontal direction. However, the levers 16 of the unit disclosed in the patent to Gelati are not spaced from one another in the same first direction, but instead they are spaced from one another in a second direction which is perpendicular to the first direction. Thus, summarizing the above, it can be said that in the unit disclosed in the patent to Gelati while on each side of the device the two holes 3 are spaced in a first direction, the two levers are spaced from one another not in the first direction, but instead in the second direction which is perpendicular to the first direction.

It is believed to be clear that the new features of the present invention which are now defined in the amended claims 1 and 7 are not disclosed in the patent to Gelati and can not be derived from them as a matter of obviousness, since Gelati discloses a completely different construction of the connecting unit.

The Examiner rejected the original claims over these references as being anticipated. In connection with this, it is believed to be advisable to cite the decision in re Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) in which it was stated:

"Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim."

Definitely, the patent to Gelati does not disclose each and every structural element of the inventive unit or thick quick connecting and disconnecting of conductors as defined in claims 1 and 7.

It is therefore believed that the anticipation rejection applied by the Examiner against the original claims should be considered as not tenable with respect to the amended claims 1 and 7 and should be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 7 should be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art and should be allowed.

As for the retained dependent claims, these claims depend on claim 1, they share its presumably allowable features, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that they should be allowed as well.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27233

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES


Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:


- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☒ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



Best Available Copy


Europäisches Patentamt
European Patent Office
Office européen des brevets

(11) Publication number:

0 246 199
A2

(12)

EUROPEAN PATENT APPLICATION

(21) Application number: 87830076.3

(51) Int. Cl.²: H 01 R 4/48
H 01 R 13/514

(22) Date of filing: 03.03.87

(30) Priority: 15.05.86 IT 2044386

(43) Date of publication of application:
19.11.87 Bulletin 87/47

(84) Designated Contracting States:
AT BE CH DE FR GB LI NL SE

(71) Applicant: ELETTO GIBI S.p.A.
Via Tre Castelli, 6
I-20145 Milano (IT)

(72) Inventor: Galetti, Bruno
ELETTO GIBI S.p.A. Via Tre Castelli, 6
20142 Milano (IT)


(74) Representative: Cicogna, Franco
Ufficio Internazionale Brevetti Dott. Prof. Franco Cicogna
Via Visconti di Modrone, 14/A
I-20122 Milano (IT)

(64) An electrical connector.

(57) A terminal block for the electrical connection of conductor wires or cables has one or a plurality of adjacent and mutually connected box-like bodies (1) in the end walls of which are formed apertures for receiving the ends of wires to be connected.

Within these box-like bodies there is a three dimensional structure (6) shaped in trapezoidal form, made of elastic, electrically conductive material, having its shorter side defined by a reaction plate (10) projecting beyond the two inclined sides of the trapezoidal form itself, and the dimension of which, in plan, reproduced that of a plate defining the longer side.

Levers (16) having underlying teeth (17) may be provided to press the tongues (8) away from the reaction plate (10) to facilitate insertion of a wire, or a cover may be provided with holes to allow a tool to be introduced for this purpose.



Best Available Copy

EP 0 246 199 A2